

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ALSUP

CASE NO. C20-6754-WHA

CASE NAME: Sonos, Inc. v. Google, LLC

NOTE FROM THE JURY

Note No. 1

Date 5/26/2023

Time 9:35 am


1. The Jury has reached a unanimous verdict ()

Or

2. The Jury has the following question:

~~Q3~~ We would like clarification of Jury Instruction p10 section 17 "conversely, if you find that an independent claim is not infringed, you must also find that its dependent claims are not infringed." If we answer verdict 4A(i) = No, do we still consider 4A(ii)-(v) separately, or do the answers for 4A(ii)-(v) automatically become "No"?

If we consider 4A(ii)-(v)


Foreperson of the Jury

separately, do you have guidance on how to take the portion of claim 1 we consider ^{causing} ~~not infringing~~ ^{infringement} into account?

If you answer "no" to Question 4(A)(i), indicating that you have found claim 1 of the '966 patent is not infringed, then the answer to Question 4(A)(ii)–(v) must be "no" because a dependent claim cannot be infringed if the independent claim is not infringed.

Above is the answer to
Your Question in Note No. 1
Judge Wm. Alar
5/26/23 10¹⁰ AM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ALSUP

CASE NO. C20-6754-WHA

CASE NAME: Sonos, Inc. v. Google, LLC

NOTE FROM THE JURY

Note No. 2

Date 5/26/2023

Time 11:06 am

1. The Jury has reached a unanimous verdict ()

Or

2. The Jury has the following question:

Did either side provide a breakdown on affected units that were $\geq \$100$ vs $< \$100$? If so, can we have those numbers (or an indication of which TX ?)


Foreperson of the Jury

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ALSUP

CASE NO. C20-6754-WHA

CASE NAME: Sonos, Inc. v. Google, LLC

NOTE FROM THE JURY

Note No. 2

Date 5/26/2023

Time 11:06 am

The trial record does not include a breakdown of the number of units of speakers sold for $\geq \$100$ vs. $< \$100$.

Judge Alsup

5-26-23

11:50 AM

1. The Jury has reached a unanimous verdict ()

Or

2. The Jury has the following question:

The same is true for computing devices. WHA
5-26-23
11:50 AM

Did either side provide a breakdown on affected units that were $\geq \$100$ vs $< \$100$? If so, can we have those numbers (or an indication of which TX ?)


Foreperson of the Jury

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ALSUP

CASE NO: C20-6754-WHA

CASE NAME: Sonos, Inc. v. Google, LLC

NOTE FROM THE JURY

Note No. 3

Date 5/26/2023

Time 11:37a

1. The Jury has reached a unanimous verdict ()

Or

2. The Jury has the following question:

*Are any of Mr. Malakowski's Non-IPITT
GIP calculations in evidence? If so,
please provide references.*


Foreperson of the Jury

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ALSUP

CASE NO: C20-6754-WHA

CASE NAME: Sonos, Inc. v. Google, LLC

NOTE FROM THE JURY

Note No. 3

Date 5/26/2023

Time 11:33a

all of his "calculations"
were based on IFTTT,
so the answer is "No."

WHA
5.26.23
12¹⁵pm

1. The Jury has reached a unanimous verdict ()

Or

2. The Jury has the following question:

Are any of Mr. Malakowski's Non-IFTTT
calculation in evidence? If so,
please provide reference.


Foreperson of the Jury